



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,621	06/08/2000	Salman Akram	3936US (99-0066)	1302

7590 07/03/2002

Brick G Power  
Trask Britt & Rossa  
P O Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, UT 84110

EXAMINER

BEREZNY, NEMA O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2813

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/590,621

Applicant(s)

AKRAM ET AL.

Examiner

Nema O Berezny

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 36-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 36-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-28-02 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-5, 10, 14-17, 36, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghaem et al. (6,046,910). Ghaem discloses a method of forming a flip chip semiconductor die, comprising: forming a plurality of stabilizers (Figs.1,2 el.41) comprising a dielectric material and adhering to the active surface of said die, said stabilizers being configured to at least partially stabilize an orientation of said die when disposed face down over a substrate, and positioned between a periphery of said die surface and conductive structures (Fig.1); and wherein said stabilizer is adjacent at least one corner of said active surface, and adjacent opposite peripheral edges of said active surface (col.6 lines 6-35; col.8 lines 31-36). Ghaem also discloses said stabilizers having a height that defines a substantially consistent die-to-substrate distance, and positioned so as to avoid contact with conductive traces on said substrate (Fig.1). Ghaem also discloses disposing at least one solder bump (el.32) on at least one bond pad (el.26) of said die, and disposing at least one conductive pillar (col.9 lines 19-24) on said at least one bond pad. Ghaem also discloses inverting and positioning said die onto said substrate to contact and bond conductive structures to corresponding contacts on said substrate (Figs.3-6); wherein said stabilizer is spaced from the surface of said die to said substrate, which is a greater distance than a minimum distance that said conductive structures protrude from said surface (Fig.1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2813

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem as applied to claims 1-5 above. Ghaem does not disclose providing a semiconductor wafer with a plurality of flip chip dice, or applying an insulative or photoresist layer onto said active surface and patterning said layer. Examiner takes Official Notice that wafer fabrication and patterning an insulative or photoresist layer are conventionally practiced in the semiconductor industry for the purpose of cost and time savings through mass fabrication, and mass patterning of said layer, respectively, and would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 6-7, 18-19, 23, 41-45, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem as applied to claims 1-5, 9-10, and 14-17 above, and further in view of Juskey et al. (5,264,061) and Hull (4,575,330). Ghaem does not disclose stereolithographically forming mutually adhered layers of photopolymer stabilizers to said die surface. However, Juskey discloses recognizing a location and orientation of a substrate or other object to receive layers of material (col.3 lines 8-35) and sequentially, stereolithographically forming a plurality of superimposed, contiguous, mutually adhered layers of photopolymer (col.4 lines 16-22, 29-34); Hull discloses stereolithographically adding a part to an existing structure, wherein said part is different in shape from said existing structure (col.10 lines 44-59). Hull also discloses securing

said substrate or object to a carrier in a horizontal plane prior to processing (col.8 lines 14-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the stereolithographic formation of Juskey and Hull with the method of forming a flip chip die of Ghaem. Stereolithography allows plastic parts to be used in many places where metal or other material parts are now used (Hull – col.3 lines 60-63).

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem in view of Juskey and Hull as applied to claims 18-19 above, and further in view of Migdal (5,870,220). Juskey and Hull do not disclose using machine vision in conjunction with storing physical parameter data. However, Migdal discloses a machine vision system to recognize the location and orientation of said substrate or object and storing physical parameters of said object in conjunction with a stereolithographic process (col.4 lines 3-17), wherein it is implied that the physical parameters of more than one die component is stored in computer memory with wafer fabrication. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the machine vision system of Migdal with the method of forming a flip chip die of Ghaem, Juskey and Hull in order to rapidly scan the object to be processed (Migdal - col.4 lines 3-4).

Claims 8, 13, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem in view of Juskey and Hull as applied to claims 1, 18-19, and 41 above,

and further in view of Kuniaki (JP10189653). Ghaem et al. do not disclose introducing encapsulating between said flip chip die and said substrate. However, Kuniaki discloses introducing encapsulating material between a flip chip die and a substrate, wherein said encapsulant is securable to a stabilizer (Fig.2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the encapsulating of Kuniaki with the method of forming a flip chip die of Ghaem, Juskey and Hull in order to protect said device from environmental, chemical, and mechanical stress and contaminants.

Claims 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaem as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Lin et al. (3,871,015). Ghaem does not disclose forming a stabilizer whose height is less than a minimum distance that said conductive structures protrude from said die surface, or employing a stabilizer structure to lengthen said conductive structures. Lin discloses a stabilizing structure whose height is less than a minimum distance of said conductive structures (col.5 lines 61-65), and a stabilizer which lengthens said conductive structures (col.3 lines 56-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use a stabilizing structure similar to that of Lin with the method of forming a flip chip die of Ghaem in order to control and manipulate the precise size and length of conductive structures in a flip chip device.


Art Unit: 2813

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nema O Berezny whose telephone number is (703) 305-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on (703) 306-2794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



NB  
July 1, 2002

Tuan H. Nguyen  
Primary Examiner